



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CAESAR *BELLUM GALLICUM* vi. 30. 4

In Vol. I, pp. 290 f. of this journal, Professor Dennison proposed *mortem* for *multum* in Caesar *B. G.* vi. 30. 4. Mr. Dennison thinks that the phrase *et ad subeundum periculum et ad vitandum* lacks balance; he would endow it with balance by substituting *mortem* for *multum*. He advances no paleographic considerations to explain the corruption of *mortem* to *multem*; yet neither in capitals nor in minuscules would *mortem* and *multum* look alike. Further, a phrase so simple as *ad vitandum mortem* no scribe would ever have changed save under the strongest provocation. Mr. Dennison thinks he finds such provocation in the fact that in §2 we have *multum . . . potest fortuna*. This argument may easily be made to recoil on his own head. Had *mortem* stood here, would not the scribe have thought of *mortem* six or seven lines above? would he not then have been specially slow to alter *mortem*? But waiving this, I hold that the repetition of *multum* is explainable on another hypothesis, to wit, that it is the work of a master mind, elaborating a chapter in highly artistic, flawless fashion (see below). Mr. Dennison's argument, that if we join *multum*, *plus*, *minus*, and like adverbial modifiers to *valeo* we weaken the force of the verb itself, need not appeal to us, since such considerations made no appeal to Caesar or other Romans; the Roman writers freely couple such modifiers with both *possum* and *valeo*. *valeo* does not mean to be powerful, in the sense Mr. Dennison attaches to those words; it means to have strength, the measure of strength requiring definition in each case by *multum*, *tantum*, *plus*, *minus*, etc., as accusatives of extent; or by an infinitive which likewise is in rôle an accusative of extent. Mr. Dennison thinks it highly objectionable to speak of fortune as "quite powerful," or "more powerful," on the ground that such language implies that the full power of fortune is not exerted. Caesar does not seem to have worried over this point, for in this very chapter we have *magno casu* and *magnae fortunae*; we must remember that the Romans did not distinguish *fortuna* and *Fortuna* as sharply as our dictionary-making and commentary-writing habits force us to do. Let us examine now the whole chapter for ourselves. In §1 we read that Basilus by making forced marches caught the enemy at unawares; they tell him of the whereabouts of Ambiorix, and he hastens toward the place where, say his informants, Ambiorix is.

Caesar now stops to remark, in general terms, *multum cum in omnibus rebus tam in re militari potest fortuna*. This general statement he illustrates by a specific instance, *nam magno accidit casu . . . texerunt*. This use of a *nam*-clause to illustrate a general assertion is too common to need proof; cf., however, Horace *C. i.* 22. 9; *i.* 34. 5. This clause falls into two parts (a) *magno accidit casu . . . mortem*, which describes Ambiorix's danger, (b) *sed hoc . . . texerunt*, which describes his escape.

Mr. Dennison wrongly analyses this *nam*-clause; the words *magno accidit casu mortem* do indeed contain a reference to the escape of Ambiorix, but after all the dominant thought is that of his peril: note that *mortem*, the last word of this part, repeats the thought of *magno adferretur*. In this way Caesar makes one thought, that of peril, run from first to last through this part of his illustrative example. Quite naturally the account of Ambiorix's escape from peril takes a little more space than is allotted to the account of his peril. Now, if we were asked to sum up this whole *nam*-clause in terms of a noun, we should use the noun *periculum*. Part (a) has to do with peril faced, part (b) with peril avoided.

Finally, in *sic et ad subeundum periculum et ad vitandum multum fortuna valuit* we have a summing-up: "in this marvelous way, alike in the matter of incurring and in the matter of escaping peril, great was fortune's power." What has been said makes it clear why we have but a single noun in the gerundival group; where should that single noun, *periculum*, be placed save between the balanced gerundival phrases? The balance that Mr. Dennison so sorely desiderates is here. Horace's words to Bullatius, *quod petis hic est*, apply. The balanced gerundival phrases correspond exactly, in *anaphoric* arrangement, to the two parts of the *nam texerunt* description. Further, *multum* here is not feeble. It repeats, as Caesar meant it to repeat, *multum* at the beginning of § 2; so far there is anaphora again. *fortuna valuit* was meant to recall *potest fortuna*, in *chiastic* fashion; there is also artistic variation of the verb.

In conclusion let us take once more a survey of the whole chapter. For four lines we deal with Basilus; we see him on his way to kill or capture Ambiorix. Then Ambiorix becomes the theme. A general account of the tremendous influence that fortune always wields in human affairs and a specific account of the great rôle she played in one case incircle a description of a man's terrible peril and his incredible escape from that peril.

The chapter, then, is not weak at any point; no one but a consummate master of style could have written it. It may serve to remind us that in spite of its apparent simplicity the *Bellum Gallicum* is often highly elaborate and artistic in form.

CHARLES KNAPP

BARNARD COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

SIMIUS ISTE = FANNIUS?

Porphyrio *ad Hor. Sat. i. 10. 18* notes that *simius* is used for *simia*, that the reference is to Demetrius, linked with Hermogenes in 90, and that the poet has chosen this word for Demetrius *propter maciem ac*